DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 275 382 JC 860 577

AUTHOR	Petit, Susan, Ed.
TITLE	Issues in California Community Colleges. Forum, 1986.
INSTITUTION	Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	86
NOTE	23p.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT	Forum; v3 Spr 1986
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Activism; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Learning Disabilities; Lobbying; Mission Statements; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; *Remedial Instruction; Remedial Programs; Special Programs; Student Placement; Teacher Role; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

This issue of "Forum," a journal designed to provide a marketplace of ideas for California community college faculty, contains six articles on current educational concerns. First, "Seeking a Working Vision: Community Colleges and the Mission Statement," by Richard A. Garcia, argues that community colleges must put joint emphasis on vocational and transfer education, with remediation offered as a support service. Next, Bruce Anders' article, "A Pair of Shoes: Relating Remediation to Transfer," recommends ways to make remedial courses relate more directly to students' interests and majors. In "Remediation and Placement," Evanne Jardine puts forth an argument for more comprehensive student testing, placement, and follow-up, and more evaluation of remedial programs. Judy Markline's article, "A Computerized Model for Program Evaluation," describes a model which provides comprehensive information on student outcomes. Next, "Learning Disabilities and Academia," by Martha Kanter offers information on the nature of learning disabilities and describes programs and services being offered by community colleges. Finally, in "Teaching the Legislature," John McFarland encourages community college faculty to take an active political role in working for the improvement of programs and facilities at their schools. A listing of the Academic Senate Officers and Executive Committee members is included. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED275382

Issues in California Community Colleges

FORUM

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. SILVERMAN
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 860 577

THE ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
VOLUME III SPRING 1986

Issues in California Community Colleges

FORUM

SUSAN PETIT

Editor

A Publication of

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Volume III Spring 1986

3

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Assistant Editor: Susan Estes

Artwork: Ed Seubert
Janet Lindgren

The editors and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges wish to acknowledge the support given in the production of this journal by the trustees of the San Mateo County Community College District and that of Chancellor-Superintendent Glenn P. Smith. Their gracious assistance has helped immeasurably in the production of *Forum*.

Printed at College of San Mateo under the direction of Richard Wooster.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editor's Page 5

Seeking a Working Vision: Community Colleges and the Mission Statement
Richard A. Garcia, Santa Monica College 7

A Pair of Shoes: Relating Remediation to Transfer
Bruce Anders, West Los Angeles College 10

Remediation and Placement
Evanne Jardine, Santa Barbara City College 13

A Computerized Model for Program Evaluation
Judy Markline, Allan Hancock College 15

Learning Disabilities and Academia
Martha Kanter, Monterey Peninsula College 17

Teaching the Legislature
John McFarland, Sierra College 21

Academic Senate Officers and Executive Committee 23

Editor's Page

IT IS WITH GREAT PLEASURE that I present this third volume of *Forum* to community college faculty, administrators, and trustees and to others interested in the present condition and future direction of the California Community Colleges. *Forum*, which was previously published in the springs of 1981 and 1982, was created and originally edited by Jonnah Laroche of Allan Hancock College, who is now a member of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. *Forum* was created to provide a place where community college faculty and others could express their views, to be a true marketplace of ideas.

This third volume of *Forum* lives up to the high standards set by the first two volumes, due to the outstanding contributions made by the authors represented. The essays here presented reflect both the community college faculty's interest in the educational issues of the day and their commitment to an educational tradition.

Richard Garcia's concern relates directly to the study being carried out by the Commission for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education; he argues that community colleges must put joint emphasis on vocational and transfer education, with remediation offered as a support service. He further touches on the problems of equality of opportunity and equality of results. In contrast, Bruce Anders attacks the remedial question from a practical angle rather than a philosophical one by recommending ways to make remedial courses relate more directly to students' interests and majors.

Evanne Jardine, too, is sensitive to the priorities of the Master Plan and the necessity for remedial education in an open-access institution. She urges more comprehensive testing, placement, and follow-up of students and more program evaluation. As if in reply, Judy Markline describes a new program evaluation model which will provide just such information on student outcomes.

Learning-disabled students are the concern of Martha Kanter, who describes not only learning disabilities but the programs and services being offered more and more for such students at all colleges. She wishes to make faculty and others more aware of the nature of learning disabilities and more sensitive to students who have them.

Finally, John McFarland encourages readers to look at the community colleges from a broader perspective, that of the Legislature. He wants community college faculty to become more politically active so that they can better work for improvement of programs and facilities at their schools.

Each of these essays, whether practical or theoretical and whether descriptive or argumentative, provides insight into the nature and direction of the California Community Colleges. They also reveal the faculty's immense concern with serving students and with improving the colleges. I am privileged to have helped these writers put their views forward in this journal.

I would like here also to express my immense appreciation to those who have worked on the production of this journal. Susan Estes, who served as assistant editor, provided invaluable help throughout. Ed Seubert not only designed the layout but worked unstintingly and cheerfully with production. Painstaking and professional work by Janet Lindgren and the expertise of Richard Wooster have made the final product readable and attractive. My sincere thanks go to all of these people at College of San Mateo for their professionalism and enthusiasm.

—Susan Petit
College of San Mateo

Seeking a Working Vision: Community Colleges and the Mission Statement

by Richard A. Garcia

Richard A. Garcia has taught history at Santa Monica College for four years, where he has been a member of the academic senate and has chaired the curriculum committee. He has published articles in his field in various journals and is preparing a book for Texas A & M University Press on Mexican Americans during the 1920's and 1930's.

CALIFORNIA'S TWO-YEAR COLLEGES face the task of defining their mission and their proper place in higher education in the mid-1980's. But the problem is difficult, since at the heart of the discussion is the problem of finding a realistic and pragmatic working vision that mitigates the tensions between equality of opportunity in education and equality of results, and the question of public and policy commitment to higher two-year college education in contrast to just higher secondary mass education. Through the years, especially since 1960, community colleges have had their mission defined by the needs of different constituencies: communities, businesses, individuals, and general societal changes as well as an overall, across-the-board pressure for remediation. In addition, there has been the perceived but unmentioned pressure for the two-year colleges to function as a vehicle for solving ethnic, educational, and technical-vocational problems.

Due to all of these pressures and expectations, there has developed an imbalance of curriculum emphasis rather than a rational and ordered balance of academic, vocational, personal, remedial, and transfer courses. Almost lost in this cornucopia of curriculum expansion has been a stress on quality of courses, clarity of purpose, and sense of mission. As a direct result there has developed a blurred self-definition of two-year institutions. Are they in reality colleges, or just community extensions of secondary schools? This problem, in turn, has had a major impact on the faculty. Should they perceive themselves as advanced high-school instructors or as college professors? There is a major difference in style, temper, and pedagogy. Consequently, this is a central crisis. The overall task, however, is not one of only defining the mission, but redeeming it and ordering the needs of the different constituencies that have developed over the years in relation to the two central and original major functions: 1) academic preparation for transfer and 2) skilled technical/vocational training. These are the two basic pillars of the mission.

California's two-year colleges are by historic designation institutions that balance this dual mission. On the one hand, they should provide the equivalent of the first two years of college work enabling transfer to a four-year institution and the students' subsequent attainment of bachelor's degrees. An implied function of this role, however, is providing some remediation. Remedial work should be complementary to the transfer function of the two-year college, but not a substitute for it. Remediation below the senior or even junior year of the secondary school is not and cannot be a primary function of the two-year college. It should provide remedial and basic skills courses only to meet specific college-level deficiencies in the students' educational background. Thus, one emphasis of the two-year college is academic transfer courses, and not remediation.

The second important emphasis is technical/vocational training. This fulfills the mission of answering closely-scrutinized clusters of technical/vocational demands of the marketplace and business needs. President Donald R. Gerth of the California State University at Dominguez Hills has observed with some discernment that this dual mission of balancing academic and technical functions almost leads to losing sight of one side or the other of the mission. Consequently, two-year colleges are hybrid colleges with a duality of purpose: providing the first two years of a college program for transfer, while attempting to

maintain a direct link to the community via the provision of technical/vocational training. This makes the two-year college unique and of central importance within the overall educational community.

Within either curriculum category, the students may choose to leave the two-year college with an associate degree (A.A. or A.S.) or a technical/vocational certificate. The completion of the degree should not be mandatory for transfer, although a strong testing and academic and career guidance program should be instituted. Santa Monica College President Richard Moore has presented the interesting concept that two-year colleges be organized around "centers" or "schools" (*e.g.*, scholars, college prep, design, "high-tech," vocational, remedial). Each of these "center" clusters would have different standards of admission and retention, as well as certificate or degree programs. This conceptualization would be functional in carrying out a complex mission and could even offer the possibility, Moore argues, that a B.A. could be offered in one of the "centers" at some time in the future.

In addition to this central dual mission with the degree and/or certificate programs, two-year colleges have offered non-credit courses, both for adult education and for fee-supported community service classes. These programs provide an opportunity for the college to fulfill an acquired secondary mission as an institutional source for lifelong learning. Moverover, these non-credit courses as well as credit transfer and technical/vocational courses offer the "drop-in" student and the already-graduated student avenues for continued self-discovery and/or technical/vocational re-orientation.

Two-year colleges can therefore begin to define their mission by both redeeming and centralizing their original primary dual objective of providing students with 1) the basis for obtaining the first two-year college credits and subsequently transferring them, and 2) providing students with the combination of academic and technical/vocational training. Moverover, two-year colleges can also acknowledge an auxiliary derived mission to provide community members with lifelong learning opportunities through non-credit but rigorous courses—adult education and/or fee-supported community service classes—as well as closely monitoring progress through credit courses for those already having degrees and wishing to retrain. Consequently, community colleges can directly serve the degree-oriented student and the technical/vocational-oriented one, and still serve the "drop-in," the "lifelong learner," and the already-graduated student within the basic dual mission of academic transferability and technical/vocational training and transferability.

Two basic problems, however, hinder the adequate defining of the two-year institution as a college. First, the ADA funding system, which encourages a "more money just for more bodies in the classroom" philosophy, mitigates against the "equality of results" direction although it supports the "equality of opportunity" (open admissions) policy. Second, there is the problem that community college professors are overloaded with five courses. This practice leaves very little time for thinking, reading, researching, and general intellectual self-enrichment, which are the basis for good teaching.

Community colleges should carry out their central dual mission aware that they should not be guided by just temporal relevance, consumer dictates, or a call for "individualistically tailored programs." Two-year colleges should also remember that, as Professor Arthur M. Cohen of the University of California has stated, ". . . neither [two-year] colleges nor any other form of school can break down class distinctions. They cannot move entire ethnic groups from one social stratum to another. They cannot ensure the equal distribution of educational results." However, two-year colleges should always seek quality and excellence in their programs, courses, and faculty by constantly redeeming their dual mission, supervising their curriculum, evaluating their faculty, and providing them with research and development opportunities. Two-year colleges should constantly protect themselves from the onslaught of temporality, but constantly carry out the mission of a *college with a community face,* as a separate but unique link between the four-year universities and colleges and the secondary schools.

Consequently, the heart of the two-year college is to provide a college education. This will, of course, entail that academic courses meet the standards and requirements of the four-year institutions. The University of California and the California State University could easily recommend that students do their first two years at the community colleges. This would benefit both systems and allow the two-year colleges to further develop the quality of their programs. In addition, the vocational obligation could be met through both training and retraining programs. Moreover, the mission of the two-year college needs to find expression in offering educational opportunities to the lifelong learner. There is a definite need for the two-year college, but the vision has to be realistic, functional—above all, a working vision. It cannot meet

8

everyone's expectations, hopes, or dreams, nor can it be the last catch-all for any kind of remediation—socially or educationally.

Historically it must be remembered that, although Thomas Jefferson assumed that republican virtue (active citizenship) could be cultivated by education, and that educated people could better regulate their lives and live better lives, he also believed in selectivity for education: ". . . the best geniuses will be raked from the rubbish annually, and be instructed, at public expense, as far as grammar schools go," but Jefferson believed that the College of William and Mary, on the other hand, was for the genuine intellectually elite. Education in two-year colleges should be for everyone who can qualify. Providing equality of education means a commitment to standards and a sense of responsibility on the part of both college and student.

Equality of opportunity, however, does not necessarily lead to equality of results, whether mediocrity or elitism; thus, the issue ultimately comes down to a working definition of equality of preparation. Here we must consider what British scholar J. R. Pole has stated in *The Pursuit of Equality in American History* as to the need to define and redefine equality in application although not in principle:

> It may seem ungrateful, after two hundred years in which the principle of equality has been held as a moral truth given by fundamental law, to conclude that the concept should be considered as a beginning rather than an end. Yet this long period, during whose course the idea of equality has been reinterpreted to meet many different needs and contingencies, has yielded the perception that equality must itself be the result of social choice, effected by private or political decisions. This conclusion in turn represents a profound transformation from the moral ideas on which the Republic was based. The founders regarded equality as rooted in unalienable and immutable rights; though it might be the subject of changing policy, these rights were indestructible and incapable of varying with different societies and periods.

Philosophically, it must be remembered that the principle of equality in education in a mass society is important, but certainly having standards of admission, of courses, of requirements does not *ipso facto* constitute inequality. The mission of the community colleges in the 1980's must require a new definition and public commitment to the principle of equality of results and not just equality of opportunity. In essence the working vision must balance a commitment to academic excellence, individual differences, high standards, and equality—redefined. The goal must always be to define a realistic and pragmatic vision.

A Pair of Shoes:
Relating Remediation to Transfer

by Bruce Anders

Bruce Anders has taught remedial and transfer English classes at West Los Angeles College since 1979. Prior to that, he was chair of the English Department at George W. Collins High School in Chicago. He holds advanced degrees in English and reading instruction from DePaul University and the University of Chicago. He is presently director of a nine-campus Los Angeles Community College District endeavor sponsored by the Fund for Improvement in Post-Secondary Education to clarify writing standards in intermediate composition classes.

WHAT RELATIONSHIP OUGHT TO EXIST between the college transfer programs and remedial programs in reading and writing in California's community colleges? This question is on the minds of many who are now engaged in writing a new Master Plan for Higher Education in our state. This article is an attempt to provide an answer to this question and offer some recommendations from the perspective of a classroom teacher. While I have limited my subject primarily to the academic-remedial relationship, the reader should find many of my points quite applicable to the vocational-remedial relationship also. This is because in the community college setting, vocational education programs attempt to integrate specific occupational competencies with a broad general education, and this comprehensiveness, together with demands made by post-graduate licensure examinations, calls for a generally high level of reading and writing competency.

I have assumed that a community college curriculum must address problems of remediation in two areas: providing literacy skills to a pre-college-ability group and providing developmental support in reading and writing skills for those enrolled in transfer classes. Of course, remedial education at the level of literacy skills differs significantly from remedial education intended to support students already in transfer courses. Reflecting their broad base and purposes, most community colleges in the state attempt to provide both kinds of remedial courses, though sometimes the goals of and relationships between these two functions are not explicit. This confusing situation is compounded by the fact that content and standards (exit proficiencies) for the same remedial class tend to differ from college to college and within the same college, and also by the fact that program evaluation is widely ignored.

Often, students in these two groups share a common aspiration: to transfer to a four-year institution and ultimately to get a baccalaureate degree. Hence, the following three recommendations are proposed to improve the remedial function. First, for both kinds of remedial work, supply and emphasize a real academic context. Too often, the content of the basic skills classes is radically different from the content of the college-level classes, classes in which students hope to enroll once their skills improve or in which they are concurrently enrolled. College courses, however, do not use SRA kits and comprehension and vocabulary exercises from just *any* sources; rather, they use textbooks, lectures, practical field work, and the like, focused on inquiry into subject areas. The typical college subject provides in-depth reading in textbooks and supplements usually consisting of hundreds of pages. In addition, many instructors will recommend books and articles and expect students to read these as well to develop a well-rounded understanding of the subject. Lengthy concept-laden, highly structured materials, textbooks, and primary sources make up the bulk of the college student's reading. It seems reasonable, then, for students presently enrolled in college transfer classes or for those who plan to enroll in them, that remedial instruction in reading and writing be delivered in forms closely resembling those they do or will encounter. While materials must always be written at a suitable instructional level to be effective, they also should reflect the student's expressed interests and goals.

At a pre-college level, where decoding or other fundamental skills are undeveloped or dysfunctional, reading instruction is likely to be carried out effec-

tively using a very structured sequence with a phonics emphasis. But even at this very basic level, the aspirations and interests of the students should not be ignored. Most students come to a college to get a college education, and to the extent that students declare that they are on a degree path, remedial reading and writing instruction should reflect that goal by providing materials that will immerse them in the concepts and written forms of the subjects they desire to study. Providing this *academic* context for the skills we teach should create some necessary contact with the reality of college and therefore help to release our basic skills programs from some of their isolation, isolation sometimes manifested as unmanaged growth and poorly articulated goals—easy marks for critics looking for issues.

A second recommendation is to set up an evaluation process geared to reading and writing skills and proficiency levels identified by community college faculties across the state as prerequisites to success in their courses. Such a process could legitimately involve high school and university input, thereby strengthening coordination of curriculum and articulation of courses. The "rigorous program evaluation model" called for by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (p. 110) is quite possible in colleges where remedial and transfer (or vocational) classes are viewed as linked, or even as contiguous in some cases. From this perspective, the need for evaluation of remedial programs may be viewed properly as one aspect of the issue of collegewide prerequisites.

A unifying step in a valid evaluation process could be the construction of a "homemade" test, College X's (or District X's or Region X's) Reading-Writing Proficiency Test. With time and proper resources, members of the college faculty—content area teachers and basic skills teachers—are quite capable of constructing a test which could measure reading ability and/or writing ability and predict success of students desiring to enroll in the transfer-level courses taught on their campuses. Not only would a test of this kind free us from the domination of commercial testing enterprises, but, more important, it could compel us to look carefully at our curriculum and the connection between the remedial courses and the larger college program.

A suitable starting point for this task is the competency statement on reading endorsed by the three segmental senates—those of the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges (pp. 6-7). While still more generally worded than is desirable, the statement identifies seven specific areas of proficiency including comprehension of main and supporting ideas, summary skills, recognition of purpose, ability to separate opinion from fact, ability to vary speed with purpose, ability to use built-in textual features, and ability to use context. Presumably, all of these abilities could be measured at a level adequate for entering freshmen. These general statements about student ability could be used as starting points to write more specific objectives as the basis for the development of an instrument to measure college readiness in reading and writing ability. Such a test is a reasonable step toward the legitimate end of establishing collegewide skills prerequisites.

A third and final recommendation to improve the remedial function is to establish transfer readiness reading-writing programs organized around the general education framework to incorporate primary source and textbook readings, academic writing assignments, and transfer opportunities. The key assumption underlying the design of this kind of program is that transfer-bound students need and want to read and write about historically important ideas. Such a program would, therefore, attempt to be a microcosm of college studies in the general education component. A related assumption is that this approach will, by preparing students to be better readers and writers in the academic sphere, help improve the transfer rate in the community colleges where it may be used.

This would not be a remedial program in the traditional sense of that term. Instead, remediation would be offered here to close the gap between the student's aspirations to a degree at a four-year institution and his or her training, which has lacked sustained reading, text-specific writing, and discussions of the historically important ideas which are at the heart of enthusiastic college scholarship. My choice of the general education framework as an organizing principle for this class results from an attempt to provide both a meaningful context for reading and writing instruction and an obvious connection to the college transfer program. A further benefit of this kind of curricular integration would be the involvement of the college faculty as a whole (and others) in addressing the problems of underpreparedness. At a minimum, subject area teachers could help plan "units" of instruction, selecting seminal works for study, providing parallel chapters from textbooks they currently use in their classes, and composing practical and meaningful writing assignments that are based on the readings. In addition, participating faculty would be called upon to supply "transfer opportunity" events during

appropriate units of study. In this function they would discuss scholastic and employment opportunities in their own fields, provide counseling to facilitate transfer to the four-year institutions, and conduct field work or guide research projects.

In short, a transfer readiness program such as this addresses a more subtle kind of literacy problem than the problem of technical literacy (*e.g.*, problems of word-attack skills, inability to use context or find the main idea, etc.). Rather, it addresses the problem, to use E. D. Hirsch's term, of "cultural literacy." Hirsch explains what he means in an anecdote that every community college teacher will recognize:

> A few years ago, I was conducting some experiments at the University of Virginia to measure the effectiveness of a piece of writing . . . Our readers in the experiment (who were mainly university students) performed just as we expected them to as long as we kept the topics simple and familiar. Then, one memorable day we transferred our experiments from the university to a community college, and my complacency about adult literacy was forever shattered. This community college was located in Richmond, Virginia, and the experiments went well, because we began by giving the students a paper to read on the topic of friendship. When reading about friendship, these young men and women showed themselves to be, on the average, just as literate as university students. The evidence showed that, based on the usual criteria of speed and accurate recall, the community college and university groups were equally skilled readers. But that evidence changed with the next piece of writing we asked them to read. It was a comparison of the characters of Ulysses S. Grant and Robert E. Lee, and the students' performance on that task was, to be blunt, illiterate. Our results showed that Grant and Lee were simply not familiar names to these young adults in the capital of the Confederacy. The students' speed and recall declined because they had to continually backtrack through the unfamiliar material to test out different hypotheses about what was meant or referred to. (p. 10)

Surely American college students should know these "familiar names," you say? Yet those of us who teach in a community college will not be surprised to read Hirsch's anecdote: We could add our own.

Two years ago, when I was teaching a reading class at West Los Angeles College, I organized the class as a survey of academic disciplines. The class spent three to five weeks per subject area reading lengthy magazine and journal articles in each subject and textbook chapters (in whole or part) photocopied from present (or past) textbooks used here. Based on the subject of inquiry, I made writing assignments and library research assignments. In a U.S. government unit, for example, the primary sources were the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Writing assignments involved paraphrasing these documents, and the research involved reading in the *Dictionary of American Biography* and other sources where students could look up information about the lives of the Founding Fathers. One student, upon learning that Jefferson was a slaveholder, confided that he had "no idea that there were slaves back then."

Chancellor Joshua Smith, himself, succinctly answered the question with which I opened this article. In his address to the 1985 Academic Senate Fall Conference (11-1-85), the Chancellor admonished us to "make certain that [students] have a pair of shoes if they are academically barefooted in terms of skills, and give them the opprotunity to run the race. We should forever banish from our vocabulary the phrase, 'They have a right to fail.' They don't."

Nor do we. In large measure remedial classes in community colleges are intended to teach students how to read, study, analyze, and write at a level which qualifies them to compete in college-level courses. Real remediation means a chance at success. A pair of shoes to run the race.

Bibliography

The Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges, the California State University and the University of California. *Statements on Preparation in English and Mathematics: Competencies Expected of Entering Freshmen and Remedial and Baccalaureate-Level Course Work.* August 10, 1982.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Promises to Keep: Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities.* January 1983.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. "Cultural Literacy and the Schools," *American Educator,* Summer 1985, pp. 8-15.

12

Remediation and Placement

by Evanne Jardine

Evanne Jardine is director of the composition program and writing laboratory at Santa Barbara City College and has been deeply involved in developing an assessment and advisement program at her college. She has been president of her college senate and has been active in the Learning, Assessment, Retention Consortium (LARC). In 1983-84 she was president of the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC).

UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES have been providing remedial education for at least as long as we have had open access to free public higher education. In California, the Subject A requirement has been with us since before the turn of the century. The 1947 Strayer Report acknowledged community colleges as the providers of "equal opportunity for post-high-school education to all adults as well as youth," with fairly obvious implications for remedial needs. Recently, though, as falling SAT scores have recorded so dramatically, and as our incoming students' declining skills levels have verified, we have needed far more than Subject A and a few *ad hoc* reading classes to provide adequate remediation to would-be college students.

The 1983 California Postsecondary Education Commission report *Promises to Keep* attempted to describe the magnitude of remedial education in California's post-secondary institutions. It also recommended that the University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU) systems develop plans to phase out remedial programs on their campuses, perhaps by working jointly with local community colleges. The Commission for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education has developed a taxonomy of remedial programs that begins with Subject A and Advanced Algebra as the top level of remedial courses—acceptable at universities—and descends all the way to a pre-elementary level which teaches basic life and coping skills. A recent California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office study estimates that, using this taxonomy, 35% of entering community college freshmen enrolled in English and math are below college preparatory high school level and 17% would fall below the 9th-grade level.

As we can see from even this brief introduction, several forces are working to increase the amount of remedial education that needs to be offered at the California Community Colleges. It seems likely that the role of the community colleges as the primary post-secondary providers of remedial education will be affirmed in Sacramento. Demographers' predictions about the future student population in California suggest that the need for remediation will not disappear, even though high schools will increase their graduation requirements. Will the California Community Colleges become remedial institutions, using more and more of their scarce resources to improve the skills of underprepared students and returning adults, while having fewer dollars to provide transfer programs and state-of-the-art technical and vocational programs? This possibility has become a cause for alarm amongst some members of the community colleges' faculties and administrations.

How can we avoid that fate without limiting access to community colleges—without closing the open door?

We need to sort out some fairly complex issues that have been getting publicity in the last few years. First we must discuss the advisability of the so-called academic floor, along with its access and funding implications; then the matriculation guidelines; and, finally, the impact redirected UC and CSU students might have on the community colleges. Germane to these are the recommendations of Chancellor Joshua Smith on student persistence. CSU's plan to reduce remedial classes and demographers' predictions about our future student population tell us a story as well.

Community colleges do not require transcripts from their entering students. Until recently, most did not test entering students to determine their skill levels, even if the students were enrolling in English and math. We have not wanted to appear unwelcoming. We did not want to discourage those "adults as well as youth" who might find their way through the open door to our campuses. As a result, we established, in addition to the much-publicized revolving door, a holding tank for the less capable and the less motivated students.

In this holding tank we have a cadre of students who are not likely to benefit from college-level

instruction but who stay on at community colleges taking and retaking remedial courses. The Chancellor estimates that in English 2.2% of entering freshmen and in math 3.7% are enrolled in elementary (K-6) or lower-level skills development courses. We do not know how many other students should be enrolled in these classes, nor do we know how successful they are subsequently. There have been few systematic evaluations of the effectiveness of remedial programs, and, because we have only recently begun testing students, we do not know how many with wholly inadequate skills have tried and failed in regular college programs.

The perception, real or imagined, that students enrolled in these basic courses do not progress to the point of successfully completing college-level courses has resulted in calls for an academic floor. If we do not admit students whose skills are below the 9th-grade level, a widely suggested cutoff, we will avoid some of these problems. We will also close the door on students who might be able, within a reasonable amount of time, to prepare themselves for college-level work in either the transfer or the vocational programs, or qualify for certificate programs. In addition, if we adopt such an academic floor, 17% of new students would be excluded. Perhaps even more would be identified by mandatory entrance tests. What could easily exceed a 20% decline in enrollment would have severe financial implications, and not just for the community colleges. These students would be lost to the community colleges and would need to be trained by other programs to the point where they could earn a living. Would the state end up saving money? Or should the community colleges continue this training?

Should we continue to provide free access to community colleges? If the answer is yes, and I believe it should be, we must meet the challenge of assuring that students are making progress through remedial programs and into degree-level or certificate programs. Chancellor Smith's recommendations to the Board of Governors on December 5, 1985, begin to address the need for accountability and control over remediation. He suggests that all students be tested and counseled on the results of those tests; that admission to the college does not constitute admission to any specific program; that all students, whether enrolled in remedial or other programs, be accountable for their progress by maintaining a 2.0 GPA and satisfactorily completing 50% of the units attempted each semester. Of course, tracking students and enforcing performance criteria necessitate appropriate assessment.

If the proposed Assessment Plan is fully implemented throughout the state, entering students will be tested, and we will be able to monitor their progress. It is important that community college students, especially those enrolled in remedial courses, have an academic or vocational goal. We should recognize that our goal is to improve students' skills so that they can benefit from *college-level instruction*. Those students who need basic skills instruction but who do not demonstrate sufficient progress towards college-level skills should be counseled about vocational and educational programs available to them in the community, but they should not be allowed to continue indefinitely to accumulate institutional credits to no end. This does them a grave disservice and is an inappropriate use of resources.

A final area I would like to touch on is what we can expect for the future. Who will the new remedial student be? Some fear that we will be inundated by underprepared students from UC and CSU, that we will become exclusively remedial institutions. CSU has adopted a five-year plan to phase out most of its remedial programs. This plan is not based on an assumption that remedial students will be sent to community colleges, but on the assumption that their entering students will be better prepared as tougher course requirements for freshmen come into effect. If they are right, and so far the data are very scarce, we may not be engulfed by a flood of "wanna be" university students.

Not only policy decisions are likely to affect community college remedial education. Demographers tell us that the population is changing. Hispanic students will soon constitute more than half the California K-12 student population. Historically, Hispanics are the most likely to drop out of high school. If they graduate, they have the lowest college-going rate of any group. Hispanics are already heavily represented in remedial classes and underrepresented in college-level classes. Designers of remedial programs must address this issue and work with members of the Hispanic community to improve the Hispanics' chances of success in college.

As the segment of post-secondary education in California that most clearly represents the democratic ideal of equal opportunity to education, community colleges must recognize that keeping the door open is not enough. We must find means of making our remedial programs and our counseling programs more effective, so that all students with potential have the best possible opportunity to realize it. Those without potential for college work must be directed to more appropriate training to prepare them to earn a living.

A Computerized Model for Program Evaluation

by Judy Markline

Judy Markline teaches English and chairs the Language Arts Department at Allan Hancock College. A Fellow of the South Coast Writing Project, she has written articles for the Writing Lab Newsletter *and* inside english *and co-authored a textbook,* Thinking, Writing, Discovering, *to be published this fall by Holt, Rinehart and Winston.*

ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE (AHC) and Santa Barbara City College (SBCC) are involved in a project, supported by the Fund for Instructional Improvement, to develop a model for program evaluation for use initially with the remedial English curriculum at both colleges. Such a model is not new. Many community colleges throughout California have developed models for program evaluation. However, most of these models require tracking students by hand. Our consortium project proposes to develop a computer program to retrieve and organize student transcript information necessary for the program evaluation model. A second program provides for the interface of the AHC program with the computerized student data base at SBCC. In addition to the computerized tracking and interface programs designed in consort, faculty and staff on both campuses have developed instruments to measure factors not available in the student data base. This spring the complete model will be applied to the remedial English programs at both colleges in order to determine its usefulness in program evaluation.

Those of us involved in the model development at both colleges are rather excited. We feel that the impact of the project will be apparent in three major areas. First, a reliable program evaluation model will be of value not only in reviewing remedial programs but also in any program review activity. Second, the information gained through the evaluation will strengthen the content and scope of the remedial English program at both colleges. Finally, the program review model will provide an essential component in the assessment and counseling process.

The transferability of the project is enhanced by virtue of its being conducted in consort. This partnership assures more general criteria for the model and also more meaningful results, since the information will be based on two different colleges serving two different communities. More important, this team approach, as recommended in the Butte study (Butte 1985), provides a wide range of expertise: educational researchers, remedial faculty, statisticians, and computer programmers working together on the project design and its implementation.

Before the two colleges decided to work together to develop the computerized system, we struggled separately with limited funds trying to evaluate our programs. At SBCC, efforts at evaluation began in spring 1984. Although this formative evaluation model has been useful, Dr. Elaine Cohen, Dean, Instructional Services, who directed the evaluation program, found it time-consuming and costly to track students by looking up records by hand and to input the data into the terminal for statistical analysis. Also, longitudinal studies conducted in this manner were impractical. At AHC we had used a computer program which provided minimal tracking of a sample of students. Presently we use a program at registration which reports a student's progress through the English program sequence. In addition, we have other programs that provide information at the class and Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) code level.

However, these existing programs neither track students through a sequence of classes nor summarize longitudinal data. Both colleges needed a computerized program to track students from wherever they entered the remedial sequence through and into the mainstream. We knew such information was essential for an evaluation model for remedial programs.

So we decided to work together to solve our problem: to design a model for program evaluation. Like most colleges nationwide, we both have well-developed remedial programs, but, as is true for most colleges, the success of these programs has not been documented or formally evaluated (Roueche 1984). Both of us had examined various data about our programs in

essentially a subjective manner. We knew that this approach lacked the rigor and reliability which should characterize an evaluation plan. More important, until such a program evaluation model existed, we could not fully implement an effective assessment and placement plan.

Our evaluation model is a two-stage one, though the stages are really two levels of activity. The first level focuses only upon the activities internal to the remedial program and in cases where only formative evaluation is appropriate. The second level assesses the interface phase where students move from the remedial program into the mainstream curriculum of the institution. At this level we gather information on the courses completed, the kinds of courses, and the students' GPA's. Included in this phase is the qualitative information such as the perceptions of the students, faculty, and administration. Again, we know that the success of a remedial program exists not in the ability of students to survive within that program but rather in the ability of students to complete the remedial program and make a successful transition into the mainstream curriculum.

For this project, our computerized tracking system will summarize longitudinal data from fall 1983 to fall 1985. This system will provide us with statistical analysis of students' persistence in/through program sequence, persistence within a class, appropriate placement, total units attempted and completed, and overall GPA's. This system will also provide an analysis of performance and retention statistics for remedial classes compared with collegewide statistics.

As with any good program evaluation model, SBCC has developed qualitative surveys to measure student success factors not available from the computer data base. Through these surveys we will gather information from students and faculty about attitude, self-concept, motivation, goal setting, and other such affective experiences.

By late March, Elaine Cohen and I will have applied the evaluation model to the remedial English programs at our colleges, and by early summer we will have completed our descriptive report of the project, which we will gladly share. The computer portion of the program will be available to other community colleges, if they provide the necessary resources for interfacing with their own systems. The model with the computer program and other instruments will be adaptable to any college that has a computerized form of student transcript history.

Bibliography

Butte College. *Evaluation of Remedial Programs Pilot Study Final Report.* Oroville, CA: Butte, 1985.

Roueche, John. *College Response to Low-Achieving Students.* HBJ Media Systems, 1984.

Learning Disabilities and Academia

by Martha Kanter

Martha Kanter is an expert in learning disabilities and directs support services at Monterey Peninsula College. She holds a master's degree in education from Harvard University and is a doctoral student at the University of San Francisco. She has served as president of the California Association of Post-Secondary Educators of the Disabled (CAPED) and is presently chair of the South Bay/Coast region of the Learning, Assessment, Retention Consortium (LARC).

STUDENTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES are attending California's institutions of higher education in ever-increasing numbers. Over 12,000 learning-disabled students attend the community colleges. According to the most recent Biennial Report on disabled student services from the California State University system, "the number of learning disabled students increased by 40% between Fall, 1982 and Fall, 1983." In January 1985, the University of California reported that "the number of University students who have verified learning disabilities has nearly doubled in the last five years." There are LD students at Monterey Peninsula College, UC Berkeley, Stanford—in fact, at the majority of two- and four-year colleges in California and the nation.

In over 90 California community colleges, many of these students receive support services and instruction through LD programs. LD students who transfer to CSU or UC campuses are eligible to receive similar services. Who are these students, what are they like, and how are they different? What is an LD program? Who are the faculty LD specialists? How are these programs integrated into campus instruction and student services?

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

On the heels of landmark federal legislation passed in 1966 (PL 94-142) and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, major legislation was enacted in California under AB 77 (Lanterman, 1976) and its subsequent amendment act AB 2670 (1978) authorizing programs and services for disabled students in the California Community Colleges. ACR 201 (1976) was also enacted on behalf of disabled students, establishing guidelines for the California Community Colleges, CSU, and UC. Categorical programs for disabled students were set up at each community college, using set-aside funds to pick up the "over-and-above cost" of educating a person with a disability. For example, expenses for readers, interpreters, or notetakers are costs that institutional budgets do not pick up. The first formal learning disabilities program was established at De Anza College in Cupertino, California, in April 1975.

This legislation sought to encourage the representation of disabled persons in higher education; the dramatic increase in disabled students since 1976—from approximately 10,000 to over 55,000 at present—speaks for itself. During this past summer (July 1985), ACR 3 was passed to provide further impetus for postsecondary institutions to encourage disabled students to attend college.

Under law, California community college students with physical, communicative, or learning disabilities are served through a carefully designed set of essential support services and special classes. The purpose of these services and classes is to "mainstream" disabled students; that is, make reasonable accommodations to provide equal access to higher education for persons with disabilities.

Most college faculty and staff are familiar with students who have an orthopedic or visual handicap—handicaps which are easily visible (*e.g.,* an individual in a wheelchair, with a guide dog, or a cane). Perhaps not so well-known or understood are students with learning disabilities.

WHAT IS A LEARNING DISABILITY?

Specific learning disability is a "hidden disability," resulting from a presumed neurological limitation or imbalance affecting an individual's ability to learn—to receive and express information. Recent medical and neuropsychological breakthroughs have revealed much about the nature of information-processing disorders. Learning disorders may occur in the areas of visual perception (*e.g.,* reading letters backwards [reversals], inverting letters or numbers, or transposing words, to name a few); auditory-processing (*e.g.,* hearing intermittent background noise or hearing only parts of what is said in a lecture); perceptual-motor (extreme difficulty in fine-motor coordination resulting in illegible handwriting, poor notetaking skills, shaky or wavy lines when copying); reasoning, oral language, memory, and related cognitive processes. These deficits impair the student's ability to learn. As a result, LD students learn "differently" when compared to the norm.

Imagine that a sporadic short-circuit exists in your central nervous system; when one or another synapse misfires, you read letters in reverse order. Consider how frustrating it might be for you to read the assigned textbook, or the blackboard. Further, since a learning disability is not seen, it is most difficult for others to grasp its nature. Due to its intermittent characteristic, like an erratic circuit going on and off, LD is perhaps the most elusive of disabling conditions. The very nature of a learning disability produces immense frustration, yet another barrier that LD students must overcome.

In the words of a community college student who recently transferred to San Jose State and is currently completing his upper-division courses, "Friends and family commented that they wanted to see me work harder and to apply myself, but as hard as I worked, it seemed to take forever to get through school . . . even though I do not use a wheelchair or a pair of crutches, I am indeed handicapped. My handicap is invisible. When I read, I do not have images connected to the words that I see. I see the world differently. I don't want to focus the lens of my understanding on my disability but on the learning advantage I possess so that I can contribute to the lives of other people."

SOME COMMON MISCONCEPTIONS

Because of the complexity of this "hidden" disability, it is often confused with other disorders, most commonly mental retardation. ***However, students with learning disabilities possess average to above-average intelligence and demonstrate the ability to succeed in college-level coursework.*** In the 1950's and 1960's, LD students were commonly misdiagnosed as slow learners, MR's, or underachievers. While students with learning disabilities may simply appear to lack basic skills, they are fundamentally different. The job of the LD specialist is to differentiate these students through assessment in order to provide appropriate intervention strategies. LD students have benefited tremendously from improved faculty and counselor awareness of learning disabilities characteristics. Through support services and special classes available in LD programs, LD students can take a broader range of college-level offerings and function on an equal footing with their non-LD peers.

WHAT HAPPENS IN AN LD PROGRAM?

A typical on-campus learning disabilities program is located within or near a learning resources center or developmental skills laboratory. Names such as Educational Diagnostic Center, Educational Services Center, or LD Laboratory are common. Referrals to an LD program often come from faculty members who observe that a student has promise but "just can't seem to get it"; from an assessment center; from a reading, writing, or math lab; or through a self-referral. Results of a study conducted by the Chancellor's Office in 1982 showed that referrals also come from counselors, high schools, parents, the California State Department of Rehabilitation, and peers—in short, a broad referral base.

LD programs are coordinated by a learning disabilities specialist (typically a tenured faculty member) holding a master's degree in special education with a major in learning disabilities. Support staff usually include a lab assistant and tutors. Upon referral to an LD program, a student undergoes a set of assessments (academic, aptitude, perceptual-motor, and language) designed to identify a pattern of responses characteristic of LD. In interpreting the test data and any previous records, the LD specialist first establishes that a student has average to above-average intellectual ability. Next, the results are examined to determine the existence of significant discrepancy between aptitude and achievement (*i.e.,* a student shows potential but has a severe reading,

writing, or mathematics deficiency). Further, an information-processing deficit must be evident. The student must also have demonstrated success in at least one academic or vocational arena. The LD specialist also ascertains that the learning disability persists despite appropriate instruction in the regular standard classroom. Behavioral observations made by the LD specialist may further corroborate findings of the tests administered.

Results are summarized and reviewed with the student and other staff as appropriate. If a specific learning disability is diagnosed, an individual education plan is developed for the student. This plan most often includes a combination of support services (*e.g.*, tape recorder, tutor, notetaker or other auxiliary aid) and one or another special class taught by the LD specialist, most usually with concurrent enrollment in one or more regular classes. The LD specialist monitors progress based on the individual education plan and amends, changes, or closes the plan as the student's goals and needs are met.

ACCOMMODATION AND INTERVENTION ARE DIFFERENT FROM REMEDIATION

Examples of accommodations provided through the LD program include tutorial assistance, equipment loan, readers, notetakers, registration assistance, specialized counseling, and curriculum modifications, as reported by the majority of community colleges in the 1982 Chancellor's Office study.

Dyslexia is a commonly used term for a learning disability affecting an individual's ability to read. Nelson Rockefeller suffered dyslexia but was able to compensate through a variety of modes: a reader, a secretary, and a tape recorder.

The content of special classes for students with learning disabilities focuses on teaching intervention strategies which assist students in compensating for their information-processing deficit(s). At the same time, students seek to develop college-level study and related skills. The intent of such classes is to demonstrate parity between the student's aptitude and achievement. Students aim for success in regular classes—the goal of "mainstreaming."

Deficiencies in cognitive processes are not cured in an LD Program. An LD student, having learned appropriate intervention strategies, may be able to succeed in regular college-level courses using techniques that allow him or her to "fill in" missing information using other senses. For example, a student with a visual perceptual deficit may be unable to take notes from the blackboard. Such a student might be taught to tape record lectures, garner appropriate notes from the tape in an outline format, and thus alleviate confusion arising from inaccuracies in visual perception. Self-correcting strategies are taught which help LD students catch and correct their own mistakes. Rereading, rewriting (or recalculating), and recorrecting are the 3 R's for students with learning disabilities.

THE LD PROGRAM: AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The LD program most usually falls within the domain of the Dean of Instruction, Dean of Students, or Dean of Developmental Education (a more recent college division set up by a number of community colleges to address the large number of students lacking basic skills.) LD programs are microcosms of a total community college system, offering an instructional component (special classes) as well as support services, assessment, counseling, and administration. LD programs are incorporated into divisional structures unique to each campus, dependent upon the way in which the institution addresses students with special needs. LD programs are a part of the disabled students program and must meet all of the conditions and criteria for LD programs outlined in Title V regulations governing the California Community Colleges under the Education Code.

As is the case with every instructional program and support service offered in California's institutions of higher education, LD programs must meet increasingly specific and strict eligibility criteria and program standards. In September of 1984, the Chancellor's Office was awarded a three-year, half-million-dollar federal grant from the Department of Education to complete its work in formalizing LD programs for the community colleges, a model that will serve as a national standard for postsecondary LD programs across the country.

ON THE HORIZON

Each year, thousands of students graduate from California's high schools. National estimates are that approximately 10% of these students have a specific learning disability. And yet, of the 1.1 million students currently enrolled in California's community colleges, fewer than 13,000 identified LD students have received supportive services to date. Although the State of California, and its institutions of higher education, recognize the legitimacy of LD as a verifiable handicapping

condition, LD students remain critically underrepresented in postsecondary education. For students with learning disabilities, the availability of support services and LD instruction can make the difference between a successful college experience and failure. At a time when every offering at a community college is under legislative, fiscal, and administrative scrutiny, let's take some time to appreciate valuable programs such as these in which we can all take pride.

Bibliography

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. *Learning Disabilities Handbook*. Sacramento, CA: 1980.

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. *1981 Study Report to the Legislature*. Sacramento, CA: 1981.

California State University Office of Educational Support Services. "Report on Services to Students with Disabilities," *Disabled Student Services Program Biennial Report*. December 1984.

Ostertag, B., et al. "Learning Disabled Programs in California Community Colleges." *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, Nov. 1982.

University of California. *Biennial Universitywide Evaluation Services to Students with Disabilities 1982-1983 and 1983-1984*. Jan. 1985.

Van Meter, L. et al. *CAPED White Paper, a Series on Higher Education for Students with Disabilities*. California Association of Post-Secondary Educators of the Disabled, 1, No. 2 (1986).

20

Teaching the Legislature

by John McFarland

John McFarland teaches political science at Sierra College in Rocklin, from which vantage point he keeps close watch on legislative activities in Sacramento. His thought-provoking essays are a regular feature of the FACCC Bulletin.

URGING CITIZENS TO COMMUNICATE with their elected representatives is very American. Suggesting that they go about it in a knowledgeable way seems somehow foreign, perhaps even subversive.

Yet successful lobbyists draw salaries like those of NBA centers just because they do the communicating right. One very bad slip can turn a fine idea into a burned-out hulk. As Caesar Pavase reminds us, mistakes are always initial.

Despite the skullduggery imagined (sometimes correctly) about them, lobbyists keep the legislature informed. On major bills, at least, it has been well briefed on the probable—and the remote—effects they will have. It is not, as Milton said of an earlier body, "a tyrannical duncery."

But that fact hardly absolves community college senators from participating in the political arena. Like any other public employee group, we know that our professional fate hangs from threads in Sacramento. It is not enough that legislators know the significance of laws; they must also know what we think of proposed legislation. If they can vote on our future, we can vote on theirs.

To begin with, the best guide to Sacramento politics is the pamphlet that Patrick McCallum wrote for the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges, *Target the Legislature*. It describes the entire legislative process, from bill numbering to the elaborate epiphany by which bills are transformed into law. It lists all state senators and assemblymembers, their Sacramento as well as district office numbers, and their committee assignments.

It is necessary to know as well that most measures are killed in the second house: Assembly bills in the Senate, and vice versa. Passage by the first house, then, only increases the need to support the measure.

Moreover, because the Democratic-dominated Legislature is pro-labor, it is far more likely to pass teachers' legislation than a conservative Republican governor is to sign it. If a bill passes both houses, the work of an educators' advocate is far from done. Now cards and letters are essential.

Bills can die in many places: in committees in both houses, on the floors of both houses, under the veto stamp. The rule in Sacramento is that it is far easier to defeat a bill than to get it passed. The most moneyed faculty group in Sacramento has not got a major community college bill into law in the 1980's, but it has stopped several.

All of this requires "heat," pressure, the first item on the ingredients list for politics. And, unfortunately, pressure can drive teachers out of politics.

We have to remember: when the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advances faculty positions in the Legislature, it is often at someone else's expense. This places pressure elsewhere, and the reaction is as certain as Newtonian laws. Pressure will yield pressure.

Academic Senate officers will hear from the associations of trustees, administrators, large districts, and chief executive officers. Local senate leaders might be "called in" by district leaders. The heat can be an index. If it rises, the bill has a good chance of passing. A concerted effort from the bill's opposition should be cause of jubilation. At moments like this, faculty leadership must not crumble.

And one should remember that, if the bill is introduced at Senate request, the Senate cannot afford to retreat. To do so would be to establish that it is not worth fighting for. The only time to abandon a bill is when it has been amended into something new and terrifying, or when changes have extracted all of its teeth.

And faculty must remember that pressure is a weapon open to all. Visiting the legislators, especially when faculty are directed to do so by a local senate, can be effective. Legislators are usually "back home" in their district offices on Fridays, and more often during the Interim, when the Legislature shuts down.

Letters (briefly urging action on a specific bill) can also have an impact, as can phone calls at the last minute. But phoning, to be effecive, must come in

21

salvos. Thirty is a number that begins to call attention to a bill. If your college senate can conjure up fifty or sixty calls, few lawmakers will be unaffected.

Whether visiting, phoning, or writing, know the bill number, the provisions of the bill as it has been amended, and its current location (committee, Assembly floor, etc.). If you need the information, call the FACCC office at (916) 447-8555; it does the only full-time lobbying on community college matters.

You have an especial opportunity if, in a visit to a legislator, you are asked what the opponents of the bill say about it. Be accurate and thorough in answering, but frame the answer in a way that allows you to refute their claims.

Be honest. Stereotypes to the contrary, politics is a profession that relies heavily on trust. The best advocates are noted for their willingness to acknowledge exactly what the effects of a bill are likely to be, "good" or "bad." Remember, too, that legislators are most interested in knowing the probable effects of the bill in their own districts.

If you do not have an answer to a question, indicate that you will call the information back . . . and do so.

A local senate can enhance its credibility with its legislators by inviting them on campus. Such missionary work is most needed with those who regularly vote against community colleges' interests.

If the faculty does the inviting, it should do the entertaining. A senate-hosted luncheon, carefully designed to avoid nastiness should the guest be an enemy, can be followed by a senate-conducted tour of the campus. Contrasting views of learning technologies that work and of equipment that has broken and (by dint of fiscal surgery) been left unrepaired, of leaking roofs and empty periodical shelves in the library—these can all serve as audio-visual instruction on the need for support of the community colleges.

Should none of this make a convert, consider opposing the legislator in the next election. If you have a genuine bill of particulars, demonstrating that he or she is anti-education, you can do some harm in the political arena. The Knights of Labor formulated the rule over a century ago: "We will hold responsible at the ballot box all members of congress who neglect or refuse to vote in compliance."

You need not kill a political opponent in order to succeed. Sometimes a good scare will win the respect you want.

A sophisticated local senate would know, as well, that it should honor those legislators who vote for the community colleges and on behalf of faculty issues. A luncheon could have no other purpose than to thank a pro-education lawmaker for his or her work.

And nothing helps like actively working for a candidate during election time. Assembly seats require $250,000 every two years, and state Senate seats about $400,000 every four years. There are fairly stringent state laws on soliciting and maintaining funds, but contributing will gain local faculty access to a legislator. So, too, will doing the innumerable jobs a campaign office needs—phone calls, mailings, lawn-sign deliveries.

Few of us really enjoy the political arena. We might remember, however, that opponents of many of our measures do like it: managers and trustees operate far more in a political culture than we do. That fact gives them an edge that often makes up for their relatively small numbers.

There is much left to be done if we are to recreate the community colleges into institutions of higher education. Having begun under the secondary code, often as wings of local high schools, we have had to battle to have any say at all in hiring and curriculum development, in educational and budgetary policy. Many of these fights were led by local senates, and the senates are themselves creatures of state law.

There is no professional reason we should not be able to prevent the hiring of a faculty member who is unknowledgeable in our discipline, and block a curricu lum proposal which is inappropriate for a college campus. Broad school policy and budget development cannot occur in a college without major participation by the college's faculty.

These are precisely the areas in which the community college faculty must work for the rest of the 1980's. They will require legislation, and legislation will require our participation. It is no departure from our profession of teaching to become politically active.

22

1985-86

Officers and Executive Committee Members of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

President
Mark Edelstein
Palomar College

Vice-President
Eileen Lewis
Cañada College

Secretary
Karen Sue Grosz
Santa Monica College

Treasurer
Philip Hartley
Chaffey College

Past President
Carmen Decker
Cypress College

Area A Representative
James Prager
Yuba College

Area D Representative
Erna Noble
Chaffey College

Representatives from the North

Larry Miller
Foothill College

Susan Petit
College of San Mateo

Henry Schott
Merritt College

Representatives from the South

Edith Conn
Ventura College

Terry Thomas
Southwestern College

Angelo S. Villa
Los Angeles Valley College

Representatives at Large

Debra Banks
Mission College

Alfredo Mendoza
East Los Angeles College

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges
DEC 19 1986

23